

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 936

HE 022 866

AUTHOR Greenberg, Arthur Richard
TITLE Concurrent Enrollment Programs: College Credit for High School Students. Fastback 284.
INSTITUTION Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-87367-284-4
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 52p.
AVAILABLE FROM Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Acceleration (Education); *Articulation (Education); *College Credits; College Role; *College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; Educational Benefits; Equal Education; Higher Education; High Schools; High School Students; Private Colleges; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Public Colleges; Relevance (Education); School Role; State Programs

IDENTIFIERS City University of New York La Guardia Comm Coll; *Concurrent Enrollment; Florida; Florida International University; Kingsborough Community College NY; Minnesota; Seattle University WA; Syracuse University NY

ABSTRACT

A discussion of concurrent enrollment programs, in which high school students can enroll in college-level courses before graduation and simultaneously receive credit for their diplomas and receive college credit, shows how such programs can address concerns about high school-college articulation and describes several program models in action. Two aspects of articulation are addressed: high school-college curriculum redundancy and the changing demographics of the college population, affecting the appropriateness of many introductory college-level courses. Benefits seen in concurrent enrollment programs include acceleration of progress for students, reduced tuition costs, reassurance for parents concerning their children's ability to handle college-level academic responsibilities, relief of high school senior ennui, productive interaction between high schools and colleges, improved high school faculty status, enhanced high school standing, facilitated student recruitment, grant opportunities, school-college faculty interaction, enhanced college-community relations, and social equity. Programs at Syracuse University (New York), Florida International University, Kingsborough Community College (New York), LaGuardia Community College (New York), Seattle University (Washington), and the Minnesota and Florida statewide programs are described. Suggestions for designing, implementing, and evaluating a concurrent enrollment program are given. 19 references. (MSE)

FASTBACK

284

Concurrent Enrollment Programs: College Credit for High School Students

Arthur Richard Greenberg

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Phi Delta Kappa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PHI DELTA KAPPA
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION



ARTHUR RICHARD GREENBERG

Arthur Greenberg is dean of Freshman Skills at LaGuardia Community College, City University of New York. He has been a teacher, assistant principal, and for 11 years was a high school principal in New York City, five of which were as principal of Middle College High School, one of the programs described in this fastback.

A graduate of City College of New York, Greenberg earned master's degrees in English Education from New York University and in Educational Administration and Supervision from Pace University. His doctorate in Educational Administration is from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Greenberg has published widely in the areas of career education, alternative education, and high school-college articulation. He has served as a consultant in these areas for schools throughout the nation.

The author dedicates this fastback to his wife, Fran.

Series Editor, Derek L. Burleson

Concurrent Enrollment Programs: College Credit for High School Students

by
Arthur Richard Greenberg

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 88-64031

ISBN 0-87367-284-4

Copyright © 1989 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

This fastback is sponsored by the Fordham University Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, which made a generous contribution toward publication costs.

In recognition of this "Year of the Teacher," the chapter sponsors this fastback to honor the dedicated and committed teachers throughout the world, and in particular the teachers in the Fordham University Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, whose legacy of excellence has influenced generations of citizens worldwide.

Table of Contents

What Is Concurrent Enrollment?	7
Why Do We Need Concurrent Enrollment Programs?	9
Curriculum Redundancy	9
Changing Demographics of the College Population	10
The Benefits of Concurrent Enrollment Programs	14
Benefits to Students	14
Benefits to Parents	15
Benefits to High Schools	16
Benefits to Colleges	17
Benefits to Society	18
Concurrent Enrollment Programs in Action	20
The Advanced Placement Program	20
Syracuse University's Project Advance Program	23
Florida International University's Partners in Progress Program ..	25
Kingsborough Community College's College Now Program	27
Minnesota's Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Program	29
The Florida Dual Enrollment Model	32
LaGuardia Community College's Middle College High School ...	34
Seattle University's Matteo Ricci College	36
How to Start a Concurrent Enrollment Program	39
Identifying the Students to be Served	39
Designing a Program to Serve These Students	40
Developing Relationships with Local Colleges and Universities ...	40
Determining a Budget	41
Developing Community Support	43
Evaluating the Program	45
Appendix	47
References	49

What Is Concurrent Enrollment?

Concurrent enrollment is the term used to describe programs that permit high school students to enroll in college-level courses prior to graduation and to receive credit for their diploma while simultaneously receiving college credit. Such programs sometimes are called joint- or dual-enrollment programs. The College Board's Advanced Placement Program is perhaps the oldest and best known of these programs.

Despite the success of the Advanced Placement program, historically there has been what Boyer calls a "discontinuity" between high schools and post-secondary institutions. "[E]ducators from the separate levels, with few exceptions, carry on their work in isolation. The curriculum is disjointed and guidance is haphazard" (Boyer 1987, pp. 2-3). Only recently have there been efforts to develop greater articulation between high schools and colleges. Thoughtful critics of American education, such as Ernest Boyer, John Goodlad, Dale Parnell, and TheodoreSizer, have called for a re-examination of the ways students move between high school and college and the bridges that need to be built between both institutions. "It is time to build a more effective partnership between secondary schools and community, technical, and junior colleges" (Parnell 1985, pp. 111-12).

In response, major professional associations such as the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the American Association for Higher Education and foundations such as the Carnegie

Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Ford Foundation, and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, have sponsored research, conferences, and projects dealing with articulation generally and concurrent enrollment specifically. These individuals and groups, as well as others, have focused on two major areas related to articulation: high school/college curriculum redundancy and the changing demographics of the college population.

This fastback first will show how concurrent enrollment programs can address these concerns and then will describe several concurrent enrollment models in action, some of which focus on serving the moderate achieving student. It concludes with suggestions for setting up a concurrent enrollment program in a high school.

Why Do We Need Concurrent Enrollment Programs?

As mentioned in the previous chapter, those who have studied contemporary issues related to high school-college articulation have identified two major concerns: curriculum redundancy and the changing demographics of the college population. This chapter addresses those concerns.

Curriculum Redundancy

Curriculum redundancy or duplication and overlap of content, especially during the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, has been recognized for many years. While some repetition may be necessary, even essential, for students who are deficient in basic skills, for academically able students such duplication is a waste of their time.

Several researchers have examined the extent of curriculum redundancy in high school and college. One of the earliest to investigate this topic was Osborn (1928), who found that between 17% and 23% of the topics in high school English, history, and physics were repeated in college. A comprehensive study, *General Education in Schools and Colleges* (1952), which examined the curricula of six high schools and six colleges, revealed "questionable duplication, wasted time, and damage to student interest and academic motivation" (p. 7) in history, literature, and especially the sciences.

In what is probably the most cited research on the topic, Blanchard (1971) found:

Nearly one-third of the subject matter during the first two years of college was merely a repetition of what had already been taught in high school; that is, one-third of the content of four areas of the college curriculum (English, mathematics, science, and social studies) was judged by high school and college teachers participating in the study to be little more than "high school courses rearranged into a college course and then offered under a new name, but unmistakably continuing as high school substance." (P. 38)

In addition to the educational issues raised by curricular redundancy are the financial ramifications. Blanchard estimated, based on 1965 enrollment data and tuition costs, that \$420 million had been spent in that year to teach courses in colleges that had already been taught in high schools. Taking into account the increase of the Consumer Price Index over the last 24 years, this would translate to more than \$1.5 billion today.

Changing Demographics of the College Population

The changing characteristics of students about to enter college has led to a reappraisal of the appropriateness of many introductory college-level courses. For example, the Regents of the University of the State of New York (1974) concluded that "many young people are physically, socially, and intellectually more advanced today than their parents were at the same age" (p. 6). While Kenneth Kenniston of Yale University (1970) states:

Since the turn of the century, the average amount of education received by each student group has increased by approximately one year per decade. Also, the average age for the onset of puberty has decreased by approximately one-fifth of a year per decade. Finally, the average student of a given age today appears to score approximately one standard deviation above the average student of the same age a

generation ago on most standardized measures of intellectual performance. A student in the middle of his class today would probably have stood in approximately the top 15% a generation ago. . . . Translated into individual terms, this means that the average 16-year-old of today, compared with the average 16-year-old of 1920, would probably have reached puberty one year earlier, have received . . . more education, and be performing intellectually at the same level as a 17- or 18-year-old in 1920. (P. 118)

Another compelling factor influencing the character of the college population is the demand for increased access to institutions of higher education. They are no longer the exclusive preserve of the intellectual and social elite. Beginning with the G.I. Bill after World War II and continuing with the push for equity in the Sixties and Seventies, colleges have opened their doors to an array of students representing the broad range of achievement found among the nation's high school graduates.

In June 1985, there were 2,650,000 students graduating from U.S. high schools (Rothman 1986). And in September 1985, approximately 50% of those students entered some type of post-secondary institution (Boyer 1987). Even if all the students in the top decile of the graduating class attended college, there would still be more than one million low to moderate achievers attending as well. And if historic trends prevail, the entering class as a whole will maintain a mean grade of C+ during the freshman year (Ramist 1984, p. 163). Clearly, then, many students who graduate from high school each June go on to college a scant three months later and succeed, even though they are not among the highest academic achievers.

Until recently only the intellectually talented in high schools have had the opportunity to participate in concurrent enrollment programs. Could more of the moderate achieving students profit from such opportunities? Those who say no argue that these students are neither bright enough nor motivated enough to cope with the demands of college-level work. Yet their collegiate success only a few months after high

school graduation diminishes this argument to some extent. Furthermore, other researchers who have studied the performance of moderate achievers in concurrent enrollment programs (Greenberg 1987; Tyler, Gruber, and McMullen 1987) have found that moderate achieving students generally do quite well in these college-level courses.

One argument made by those who would exclude the moderate achiever from concurrent enrollment programs is that we shouldn't be rewarding mediocrity. If they can't excel academically in high school, there is no reason to bestow status on them by offering them college-level courses and credits. Such an argument has a certain tough-minded appeal, but there is no empirical support for it. Indeed, similar arguments have been made against many efforts designed to improve the general welfare of particular groups in our society. Such programs as English-as-second-language, bilingual education, special education, scholarships for minorities, adult literacy, and a variety of affirmative action efforts have been opposed initially as catering to those who couldn't make it on their own. Yet, for many, these programs have served as an entry to a better life.

Another argument against offering concurrent enrollment programs to moderate achievers is that giving such entitlements to some will lead to demands to provide it for all. This argument has some merit if the only kind of concurrent programs offered are for the academically elite. But in fact, there are currently a variety of concurrent enrollment models, each with its own student selection criteria, ranging from open access to all students to more restrictive requirements negotiated between local school boards and cooperating colleges. Although these criteria vary significantly from state to state, they never have been challenged in the courts.

Still another argument against concurrent enrollment programs is that they will create burdensome administrative entanglements between high schools and colleges. Some, however, maintain that the appropriate response to the fear of greater cross-institutional involvement is not to avoid it but to embrace it. For example, John Goodlad states:

The most significant changes occur when two cultures bump up against one another and that's why I want the universities and schools to work together. They're different cultures. . . . The two worlds have grown increasingly distant and distinct. . . . Nothing short of reconceptualizing and reconstructing public education will suffice. (Olson 1987, p. 1)

Finally, there is the argument posed by some economists, citing employment trends showing an increasing need for janitors, secretaries, clerks, food service and data entry personnel, and other low-status jobs. They argue that encouraging more "average" students to go on to college is not in the nation's economic interests. Instead, this population cohort should be the backbone of the workforce, filling less appealing, yet economically important, jobs in our society. The reality, however, is that many average students are already choosing to attend college. And they are being accepted in both senior institutions and especially in our well-established community college systems.

Social engineering that limits opportunity may have worked in the past but is no longer acceptable in contemporary American society, where the push for equity continues unabated. If concurrent enrollment programs can serve the moderate achievers, while continuing to serve the academically talented, such programs will expand dramatically. It therefore behooves educators and other policymakers to understand the implications and potential benefits of concurrent enrollment models. This is the focus of the next chapter.

The Benefits of Concurrent Enrollment Programs

The potential benefits of concurrent enrollment models are numerous and substantial. These benefits accrue to students and to their parents, to high schools and post-secondary institutions, and to society as a whole.

Benefits to Students

The most obvious benefit to students is the chance to earn college credit while still in high school. Once in college, students can complete their programs at an accelerated rate, or they can opt for more electives and more specialized courses in their major earlier in their college careers. This benefit has long been recognized by high achieving students, most notably through the Advanced Placement Program. Only recently, however, have moderate achieving students been offered such "headstart" opportunities. With a few college credits in hand, these average students will have more time for some of the more demanding courses they will face in college.

A second benefit is reduced tuition costs. With tuition, even at public institutions, rising annually far in excess of the inflation rate, the chance to earn college credits in high school at little or no expense is a financial boon. This cost-saving is particularly attractive to students from middle-class families who are not eligible for much financial aid. Students from low-income families, although eligible for financial aid packages, often do not believe they can handle college

costs. For them, the prospect of earning college credits in high school is both a financial and psychological boost, which could be the deciding factor in whether they go to college.

Another less tangible benefit of concurrent enrollment is the motivation it provides to students uncertain about their ability to do college-level work. Fear of failure can deter some students from even applying for college admission. But if they prove to themselves that they can succeed in a concurrent enrollment course, they will no longer be intimidated by the academic demands of college.

A final benefit of concurrent enrollment is that it can serve as a cure for boredom, commonly referred to as "senioritis." By the time students have reached their senior year, many of them find school unchallenging. They often have fulfilled the basic requirements for graduation and spend the last year marking time until they get their diploma. They make take some easy electives to fill out their program, find a part-time job, or spend a lot of time just socializing. Enrollment in a concurrent program presents a new challenge; it offers an intellectually stimulating experience that both bolsters their ego and gives them a taste of what to expect when they enter college.

Benefits to Parents

Concurrent enrollment programs offer two major benefits to parents. The first and obvious one is savings on tuition costs. Just as important, however, is that such programs provide parents with some assessment of their children's ability to do college-level work.

Paying for a college education is a major concern for parents today. Evidence of this concern is seen in the variety of plans being proposed by public and private colleges, state legislatures, and the federal government to cope with the mounting costs for a college education. With many major private universities now charging \$300 and more per credit, a three-credit course taken in high school can save parents almost \$1,000. And as tuition continues to rise, college credits earned in high school appreciate in value.

In upper-class families children grow up with the expectation of attending college. But in moderate- or low-income families where parents have not attended college, it is a momentous decision to send their child to college. In addition to the major financial investment, parents may be concerned about whether their child has the ability or the motivation to succeed in college. Their children's demonstrated success in a concurrent enrollment program reassures these parents that their children can handle college work. This reassurance could be the crucial factor in deciding whether to help make their children's dream of a college education a reality.

Benefits to High Schools

Setting up concurrent enrollment programs offers several benefits for high schools. These include solutions to "senioritis," productive interaction with the college community, improved faculty status, and enhanced community standing. Each of these benefits is discussed below.

"Senioritis" is often joked about, but it is a real and perplexing problem for high school administrators and teachers. It is manifested in ennui among even the most able seniors. Truancy, cutting classes, and other disciplinary infractions are common. Some of the most able students, having met the diploma requirements, leave school in mid-year, thus reducing the pool of students available for advanced elective courses. Offering seniors an intellectually challenging college-level experience, with its concomitant financial advantages, can be a constructive solution for combating "senioritis."

A second benefit of concurrent enrollment is that it opens lines of communication between high schools and colleges, which may not have existed previously. Counselors involved in college advising typically develop close working relationships with a cooperating college. Scholars from the college may be available as guest lecturers. High school and college faculty sometimes get involved in writing grants for joint curriculum projects that benefit both institutions.

Participation in concurrent enrollment programs can enhance the status of teachers in many ways. For example, a high school teacher might be designated as adjunct faculty and receive extra compensation from the college for teaching a course. There also is the opportunity for teachers to work with college faculty from the same discipline in a variety of professional development activities. All these experiences can have a salutary effect on teacher morale.

A final benefit of concurrent enrollment programs to high schools is the positive image they convey to the community. With the exception of Advanced Placement courses, such programs are not commonplace in most communities. If a high school can boast that it has several of these programs serving a range of student interests and abilities, then the community can take pride in the innovation. And since these programs usually can be mounted without much additional cost, they provide taxpayers with tangible evidence that good education is available at reasonable cost.

Benefits to Colleges

The benefits colleges derive from involvement with concurrent enrollment programs include student recruitment, grant opportunities, school-college faculty interaction, and community relations. Each of these is discussed below.

When a college enters a partnership relationship with a high school, it has access to students, their families, and counselors who do college advising. In addition, many colleges invite concurrent enrollment students to visit the campus, use the library, and take part in campus events. If students have a successful experience in a concurrent enrollment program, earn college credits, and have some exposure to the ambience of college life, they are likely to consider that college as one they might want to attend after graduation. These students also can exert influence on peers to attend the college. When students are enthusiastic about the program, then parents, teachers, and counselors are likely to encourage them to enroll in the college.

Such kinds of both direct and indirect support are not lost on college admissions personnel.

Concurrent enrollment programs are a fertile area for obtaining grants. Many foundations and government agencies have specific provisions built into their requests for proposals calling for better articulation between high schools and colleges. Some potential areas for grants include teacher training, curriculum development, technical and vocational training, increasing the pool of minority teaching applicants, replication of concurrent enrollment models, and enrollment of first-generation college attenders.

Concurrent enrollment programs can foster a sense of collegiality among high school teachers and college faculty. As they work together on program development, college faculty can help high school teachers keep up to date on research in their respective fields; the teachers, in turn, can acquaint college faculty with current curriculum practices and the academic preparation of high school students. Joint efforts at curriculum planning can help to bridge the gap that has characterized high school-college relationships in the past.

A final benefit that concurrent enrollment programs give to colleges is a positive image in the community. When high school students can earn college credits at little or no cost and when the community sees the college as an active partner with the public schools, the college is perceived as a vital force in the community.

Benefits to Society

When one adds up the benefits discussed in the previous sections, it is apparent that concurrent enrollment programs make a contribution to society at large. With the credits earned while still in high school, academically able students can begin to do advanced work earlier in their college careers. And when average students — especially minorities and the poor — have access to these programs, they can realistically assess their ability to do college-level work. Many will discover that the dream of a college education is well within their

reach. Boyer (1983) addresses the issue of access and equity when he states:

To expand access without upgrading schools is simply to perpetuate discrimination in a more subtle form. But to push for excellence in ways that ignore the needs of less privileged students is to undermine the future of the nation. Clearly, equity and excellence cannot be divided. (p. 6)

In the early Sixties, Rexford G. Moon, director of the College Scholarship Service, estimated that 150,000 able youths a year from the lower income levels did not continue their education beyond high school for one reason or another (Sexton 1961, p. 187). Today, this loss of talent continues. For example, between 1980 and 1985 black enrollment in colleges declined at a time when enrollment for all other groups rose (Rothman 1986). Again Boyer (1987) puts it succinctly: "Opportunity remains unequal, and this failure to educate every young person to his or her full potential threatens the nation's social and economic health" (p. 5).

It is in this context that current enrollment programs take on such significance, because they symbolize society's commitment to equity and access not only for the academically gifted but for everyone.

Concurrent Enrollment Programs in Action

This chapter offers descriptions and analyses of eight concurrent enrollment programs. Some are local and involve only a single high school and college. Others operate at state, regional, or national levels. Some are taught by high school teachers, some by college faculty. Some are located at the high school site, others on the college campus. The programs serve a cross-section of students, from those at risk to high achievers. While each of these programs may be viewed as a prototype, many variations are possible and, in fact, do exist.

The Advanced Placement Program

No description of concurrent enrollment programs would be complete without including the College Entrance Examination Board's Advanced Placement (AP) Program. It is probably the best known, most widely implemented, and most thoroughly researched program of its type.

The AP program was formally adopted by the College Board in 1955, following an experimental period involving the cooperation of several private colleges and universities. The purpose of the program is to offer academically able high school students an opportunity to take college-level courses. Over the years the program has grown substantially and, according to the *1988 AP Yearbook*, now serves approximately 200,000 students in about one-third of the nation's schools.

Program Design. The AP program allows high schools to offer college-level courses in a variety of disciplines. The courses are designed by teams of high school and college educators. The courses are taught by local high school faculty, most of whom have received training at workshops sponsored by the College Board.

Students earn high school credit for successful completion of an AP course but do not automatically receive college credit. To receive college credit students must take the AP exam, a standardized test administered by the Educational Testing Service. Students then submit the results to the college they expect to attend.

The AP exams are graded on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 meaning extremely well qualified for college credit, 4 – well qualified, 3 – qualified, 2 – possibly qualified, and 1 – no recommendation. However, colleges are not compelled to grant credit for AP courses, not even to those receiving a score of 5. Some colleges grant credit for AP courses in lieu of their own freshman courses. Others may grant elective credit but still require students to take their required courses in the AP subjects. Some will not grant credit but will grant advance standing in the AP subject area. A few grant neither college credit nor advanced standing.

Student Population. Students enrolled in AP programs are clearly a select group academically, even when compared to their peers who also intend to go to college. Their scores on both the math and verbal sections of the Scholastic Aptitude Test are more than 100 points higher than the average SAT scores. Also, AP students indicate much greater interest in pursuing graduate degrees than do their college-bound peers.

Strengths of the AP Program. The AP program has many virtues. Chief among them are the following:

1. The program is widely known, has been refined over the years, and generally has been well received.
2. Students earning scores of 3 or better on the AP exams are likely to earn college credit in colleges and universities throughout the nation.

3. Students who take AP courses are frequently regarded by college admissions personnel as better candidates than their college-bound peers, who may be equally qualified but have not participated in the AP program.

4. The program can be implemented at little cost and without disruptions in the regular school schedule. The College Board recommends a maximum class size of 25, but adherence to this guideline is at the option of local school authorities.

5. Even though students may not score high enough on the AP exam to earn college credit (or may not choose to sit for the exam at all), they have had the experience of doing rigorous, college-level work, which is good preparation for their collegiate experience.

6. Teachers giving AP courses become part of a network of colleagues at local, regional, and national levels. They attend workshops, read and contribute to newsletters, revise curricula, and design and grade AP exams. Because of this involvement, they tend to become strong AP advocates in their school and community.

Limitations of the AP Program. While the AP program is clearly the largest and, some might say, the most successful program of its kind, it is not without its limitations. Some of these are:

1. Despite the widespread acceptance of the AP program nationally, students have no assurance that they can earn college credit for their AP work. A score acceptable to one institution for college credit is no guarantee of acceptance by another.

2. Because college credit is determined by the score on a common AP exam given nationally in May of each year, it places a tremendous pressure on students to do well on a single exam covering a whole year's work. A student who has done good work in the course but is ill, under personal stress, or simply not up to par on test day, may perform poorly on the exam and thus fail to receive college credit.

3. By its own claim, the AP program is intended for high achievers. The intellectual demands made on students necessarily limit the number who can participate. While heroic efforts on the part of average

students and their teachers can sometimes result in outstanding performance, the AP program remains one that serves that small percentage of high-performing students found in any high school.

Syracuse University's Project Advance Program

Syracuse University's Project Advance (SUPA), established in 1973, grew out of the concerns of several school districts in the Syracuse, New York, area about the problem of "senioritis." They sought help from Syracuse University's vice chancellor for academic affairs; and what resulted was SUPA, described by Franklin P. Wilbur (1984), one of its developers and its current director, as "the largest program in the country offering accredited college courses taught in the high schools by high school faculty" (p. 45). Initially the program served only high schools in the Syracuse area but has since grown to serve more than 84 high schools and approximately 3,800 students each year in New York, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, and New Jersey.

Program Design. Instruction in SUPA is done by regular high school teachers, after having attended a summer training program at Syracuse University. The courses, which are taught at the high school site, currently include biology, calculus, chemistry, English, psychology, sociology, and computer engineering. The courses cover the same content as their counterpart courses taught to Syracuse University students but have been adapted by a team of college and high school instructors to reflect the needs of high school students. The major adaptation is extending a three-credit university semester course to a year-long course for high school seniors.

On successful completion of the coursework, students take a test designed by Syracuse University's Center for Instructional Development with input from college and school personnel. Students receive high school credit for the course as well as college credit from the university. Should the student attend Syracuse University, the course is accepted in lieu of its counterpart university course and credit is granted. If the student chooses to go to another college or university,

Syracuse issues an official transcript to that institution, which then may evaluate the course as it would any transfer credit.

The SUPA credits earned by students seem quite portable, due in part, no doubt, to the reputation of Syracuse University. Wilbur and LaFay (1978), reporting on a three-year study of SUPA students who submitted SUPA credits for transfer to other institutions, found that 76% received credit and exemption from the comparable college courses, and 15% received credit but not exemption from the course.

Student Population. The profile of SUPA students is similar to AP students in that they are superior to their peers who plan to attend college. For example, the latest data available show that SUPA students averaged nearly 100 points higher than the national mean on the verbal portion of the SAT and 117 points higher on the math portion. Furthermore, 66.6% of SUPA students ranked in the top fifth of their class.

Strengths of SUPA. In addition to the general benefits of concurrent enrollment described in the previous chapter, the SUPA model has several unique strengths:

1. Although SUPA students must take uniform final exams, designed with input from high school teachers, awarding college credit is based on successful completion of a full year's work, thus giving teachers many opportunities over the year to evaluate student learning.

2. Because the SUPA teachers are appointed as Syracuse University adjuncts, they must meet the approval of the university's academic departments, based on education, experience, and recommendation. This, along with mandatory staff development conducted by the university, helps to ensure high standards for staff and a curriculum comparable to the university's.

3. Although equivalent in every respect to the university's freshman courses, the SUPA courses are spread out over a full year. This permits about twice as many student/faculty contact hours as the same courses taught in one semester to freshmen for the same number of credits.

4. Like AP teachers, the SUPA teachers are part of a collegial group, who share goals, teaching techniques, and curriculum ideas, benefiting themselves and their students, schools, and communities.

Limitations of SUPA. The benefits of SUPA far outweigh any limitations, but a few problems do exist.

1. Although acceptance of the SUPA credits by colleges is reportedly high, there is no guarantee that credits will be accepted at other institutions, except at Syracuse University.

2. SUPA is affiliated with a private university and charges tuition, although at a reduced rate. While financial aid may be available in special cases, the procedures involved in applying for aid may discourage low-income students.

3. While reaching a somewhat broader range of students than the AP program, SUPA tends to attract mostly high academic achievers.

Florida International University's Partners in Progress Program

The Partners in Progress program (PIP), sponsored by Florida International University, is another example of a private institution working with public schools in a concurrent enrollment program. PIP began in 1982 with four Miami high schools and later expanded to include 14 high schools in Dade County. The distinctive feature of this program is that it serves minority students from inner-city high schools. The program, housed on the Bay Vista campus of Florida International University in North Miami, currently serves about 200 students annually.

Program Design. PIP students are brought to the campus for two consecutive summers. The first summer involves special courses taught by high school teachers, including work in basic skills and preparation for the Scholastic Aptitude Tests. Students who are successful the first summer are invited back the following summer and enroll in regular college courses. During the second summer, students may earn as many as six college credits. Students may enroll

in one or two three-credit courses, depending on their aggregate SAT scores. Students scoring under 950 are limited to one college course; those with higher scores may elect one or two. Students receive scholarships, and fees for books and materials are waived.

Student Population. PIP's target population is minority students at inner-city high schools. Enrollment is open to any student from a participating high school with a C average or better. On the basis of high school grades and SAT scores, many of these students would not normally be considered strong college material. However, with the counseling and special courses offered within a university environment during the first summer, the university is willing to risk having them take college courses during the second summer. According to PIP's program director, Betty Young, the students' performance in their college courses is comparable to that of the university's regular freshmen.

Strengths of the PIP Program. This program has several interesting features that contribute to its success. Chief among these are:

1. The program demonstrates a private university's commitment to work with local public high schools and to invest its resources in serving an often neglected student population.

2. Most of the PIP students are the first generation in their families to aspire to a college education. Bringing them to work on the university campus provides what the literature on high school-college collaboration calls the "power of the site." That is, the university environment itself exerts a powerful influence in stimulating academic achievement and in motivating students to succeed.

3. In addition to serving the needs of a special group of students, PIP gives special attention to the cooperating high school teachers in the program. Specifically, they are asked to participate in special training sessions during the first summer, which prepare them to help students during the regular school year before they attend the second summer's program.

Limitations of PIP. Although the PIP program has many positives, there are some issues of concern.

1. Because the university does not receive any special funding to administer the program and does not have a large endowment to draw on for scholarships, the program can serve only a small percentage of the students who could profit from it.

2. Because of the mobility characteristic of students in inner-city schools, the requirement that they be enrolled in the program over two consecutive summers could limit the number who participate.

3. Although teachers are trained during the first summer for the purpose of providing some continuity to PIP students during the regular school year, heavy teaching loads and other time constraints have limited what teachers can do to advise and counsel PIP students between the first and second summers. This is an area that the PIP director hopes to improve in the future.

Kingsborough Community College's College Now Program

College Now is a program at Kingsborough Community College, City University of New York (CUNY). Like Syracuse University's Project Advance, College Now is a concurrent enrollment program in which students can take college-level courses taught by specially selected and trained high school teachers. However, the student population served is markedly different from SUPA. Begun in 1984, the program works with eight New York City high schools. Teachers in the program are approved by Kingsborough Community College and serve as adjunct faculty.

Program Design. College Now students take their courses at the high school site and receive both high school and college credit if they satisfy the course requirements. Typical course offerings include Introduction to Business Administration, Introduction to Social Science, Humanities, Introduction to Science, and Introduction to Computer Science. However, not all courses are taught at all high schools. In addition, non-credit remedial courses are offered in writing and math. College Now students also receive special counseling services from college counselors who visit the high school each week.

Students are invited to visit the Kingsborough campus at least once each semester, where they can explore the campus on their own or in guided tour groups.

Student Population. The target population for this program is students in the average range, those with 65% to 80% cumulative averages in high school (New York City high schools give percentage grades rather than the more common letter grades). Average range students are those traditionally served by New York City's community colleges.

Before being admitted to the tuition-free College Now courses, students must take a battery of tests known collectively as the Freshman Assessment Program. These tests, designed by CUNY, indicate competency levels in math, reading, and English. Following counseling by college counselors, those scoring above the CUNY-prescribed minimum are admitted. Students who fall in the remedial range are invited to participate in the remedial course offerings, with the promise that if they pass, they will be given the opportunity to take college-level courses the following semester.

Strengths of the College Now Program. The College Now program at Kingsborough Community College has several strong points. Chief among these are:

1. College Now demonstrates that it is possible to operate a concurrent enrollment program that is relatively successful with average achieving students. In a recent year, for example, the 319 students enrolled in college-credit courses earned slightly under a B - grade average. Almost 70% made a passing grade.

2. College Now provides the extra counseling support needed for students who traditionally have not had an expectation of earning a college degree.

3. By using local high school faculty as Kingsborough adjuncts for teaching the College Now courses, the program benefits from the experience and maturity of those who understand both the academic and social needs of a non-traditional college population.

4. The remedial component of the College Now program distinguishes it from the rigorous entry criteria of most concurrent enrollment programs. The promise of acceptance into college courses upon successful completion of the remedial courses serves as a powerful motivator.

5. The College Now staff has been successful in anticipating and negotiating the administrative functions needed to implement the program. They spend a lot of time working with the high school administrators to fit the testing program, counseling sessions, and other College Now events into the complex schedules of participating high schools.

6. Principals of the participating high schools report that their respective communities appreciate and value the opportunity the College Now program gives to their students.

Limitations of the College Now Program. This program has many unique features, but two limitations should be noted.

1. The College Now program is supported by special funding from the state legislature. Should this funding no longer be available, the program would be in jeopardy.

2. The college credits earned by students in the College Now program are transferable only to the extent that other colleges are willing to accept them. As a relatively new program, the transfer experience with credits earned through College Now is not yet well established.

Minnesota's Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Program

Program Design. The Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Program (PSEOP) was enacted by the Minnesota state legislature as part of the 1985 Omnibus School Aid Act. It permits high school juniors and seniors to take regular college courses tuition free at the college site, and they receive both high school and college credit.

Although the program appealed to students and parents, when it was first implemented it drew the ire of both local school officials

and teacher organizations because the tuition paid by the state for students in the program was deducted from the state aid given to individual school districts where the students were enrolled. Moreover, teachers objected because they perceived the program as a "brain drain" of their better students, who could now elect to take college courses rather than some of the advanced electives offered in their high schools.

Because of the budgetary problems it was causing local school districts, PSEOP was modified by the legislature in 1986. The following changes were made:

1. Students who plan to participate in the program must notify their high schools by March 30th of the school year prior to their participation.

2. Students may earn no more than the equivalent of two years of college credit.

3. Students must be counseled by school districts about the responsibilities and rigors of participating in college courses.

4. Students may no longer earn simultaneous high school and college credit for the college courses taken and passed; they must declare whether they want the credit counted as high school or college credit.

5. If courses are taken for college credit, the student is responsible for college tuition. If courses are taken for high school credit, the state pays the tuition to the college.

6. Students who elect to take the courses for high school credit and subsequently enter the same college after high school graduation must be awarded the college credit for the course.

These changes did not address all the objections, but they did make it possible for school districts to estimate their budgets more precisely and to prevent raids on the districts' state aid.

Student Population. The state legislation did not specify any admission criteria for the program. Instead, students must meet the regular admission standards of the institution to which they applied. The first time the program was offered in the 1985 winter quarter, 1.5%

of the 120,000 eleventh- and twelfth-graders in Minnesota participated. This number increased to 3.7% only three months later during the spring quarter — more than doubling the number of students enrolled (Randall 1986, p.14). With this sudden increase, it is understandable why school district officials were becoming concerned about the program's impact on their budgets.

Fiscal ramifications aside, it is interesting to note that the first two groups of students in the winter and spring quarters of 1985 fared as well as or better than their college freshmen counterparts in the same classes. According to a study conducted by the University of Minnesota, 31% of the high school students received grades of A, while 60% received grades of A or B (Randall 1986, p. 15).

Strengths of PSEOP. Because many of Minnesota's rural school districts have resisted state pressure to consolidate, their high schools remain quite small. With a relatively small pool of students to draw on, it is difficult and costly to staff the advanced elective courses found in larger high schools. For such districts the availability of college-level study at nearby post-secondary institutions permits advanced students with specialized interests to be served.

Limitations of PSEOP. This program is unusual in that it is open to qualified students throughout the state of Minnesota, but it does have some restrictions.

1. Since students are not allowed to earn both high school and college credit for the PSEOP courses (unless they pay tuition or, after graduation, attend the institution where they took the course), one of the benefits of a true concurrent enrollment design is vitiated. In particular, some of the possibilities for acceleration are limited.

2. The requirement that students must pay tuition if they want college credit for PSEOP courses may deter low-income students from participating in the program, unless other arrangements for financial aid can be made.

3. In areas where a college campus is a great distance from the high school, travel logistics may simply be unmanageable. Absent

alternative means of program delivery, such as television, students may be precluded from participation.

The Florida Dual Enrollment Model

Program Design. All state-funded community colleges in Florida are required by legislative act to develop a plan with local school districts that allows high school students to enroll concurrently in college courses. The legislation mandates that the courses be taught at the high school site, except in those cases in which technical facilities are available only on the college campus or when fewer than 15 high school students are enrolled in a specific class. College credits earned by the high school students are "banked" for them by the college until the students present evidence of high school graduation. A typical agreement between a college and a local board of education would include sections dealing with:

1. Procedures on how and where to provide courses.
2. Criteria for identifying students.
3. Courses to be offered.
4. Coordination of the college courses with the high school curriculum.
5. Assurances on the transferability of college credit.
6. Assurances that high school credit will be awarded.
7. Procedures to inform students and parents about courses and procedures for application.
8. Relationships regarding administrative and procedural responsibilities.
9. Provisions for coordinating courses.
10. Provisions for counseling services.
11. Provisions for selecting instructors.
12. Provisions for equitable distribution of applicable revenue between the college and the school board.

Many Florida secondary school and college administrators believe that because of the success of the dual enrollment program, it is rapidly replacing Advanced Placement programs in public high schools — largely by student demand.

Student Population. The student population served by the Florida Dual Enrollment Program varies markedly from school district to school district and from community college to community college, since in every case the entry criteria are determined by negotiations between the colleges and the school districts. Interestingly, it is not unusual for a single community college to negotiate distinctly different agreements with different boards of education in its geographic area.

Strengths of Florida's Dual Enrollment Program. The chief strength of Florida's approach to concurrent enrollment is its great flexibility. Because the legislature requires that the community college negotiate with each school district in its area, the Dual Enrollment Program takes on many different configurations. School districts knowledgeable about their local needs may negotiate with the college to ensure that resources are available to address those needs. And by making the state's extensive community college system the focal point for its dual enrollment efforts, Florida has sent a signal to students, parents, and school administrators that this is a program that is accessible even to those who are excluded from more traditional concurrent enrollment programs.

Limitations of Florida's Dual Enrollment Program. Ironically, the flexibility, which is the program's greatest strength, may also be its most serious flaw. Specifically, the fact that a community college must negotiate separate agreements to serve the expressed needs of local school boards means that the two institutions must concur on what should be a quality program for students. In some cases, negotiations will falter as a result of differing views of institutional mission or sometimes because of personality clashes between the negotiating parties.

LaGuardia Community College's Middle College High School

Most concurrent enrollment programs respect the structural distinctions between secondary schools and colleges. However, a few have attempted to alter this structure by creating separate institutions that bridge the traditional gap between high schools and colleges. One such structural innovation is Middle College High School, operated by the New York City Board of Education and located on the campus of LaGuardia Community College in Queens, New York.

Program Design. Middle College High School serves high-risk students with average academic potential. It also provides intensive counseling and emotional support. Students can receive both high school and college credit for the college-level courses they take. They also can take special courses taught by the college faculty for only high school credit. To take college-level courses, students must meet any of the following criteria:

1. A senior who is nearing completion of his/her graduation requirements.
2. A junior or senior who has demonstrated a satisfactory record at Middle College.
3. A student who has satisfactorily completed the sequence of courses in a particular area. For example, a student who has completed all high school mathematics through intermediate algebra may register for college-level pre-calculus.
4. A student who has demonstrated a talent or skill in a particular area, for example, Spanish, piano, art, or typing.

Students who wish to take college-level classes must be interviewed by one of the Middle College counselors to determine eligibility. That same counselor will monitor the student's progress periodically during the college experience.

About 90 Middle College students take college courses each year, earning from one to 15 credits. Since Middle College opened in 1974,

some 700 students, or 30% of the Middle College students, have completed college courses, earning a mean grade point average of slightly under C +.

Student Population. To be eligible for admission to Middle College High School, students must have graduated from one of six feeder junior high schools, must have been identified as potential dropouts by their junior high school teachers and counselors, and must have indicated a desire to come to Middle College. The typical Middle College applicant exhibits the following characteristics: 1) a high rate of absenteeism, 2) failing in three or more subjects, 3) social and/or emotional problems stemming from the home environment, and 4) evidence of some potential to succeed in high school work.

According to recent data, approximately 53% of Middle College students are more than two years retarded in reading, and 40% are more than two years retarded in math. The ethnic distribution of the student body is roughly 45% white, 33% Hispanic, 21% black, and 1% Asian. About 40% of the approximately 500 students are from families on public assistance. The typical Middle College student taking college courses has high school grades in the 70% to 80% range, with SAT verbal scores in the 300 to 350 range and SAT math scores in the 350 to 400 range.

Strengths of Middle College High School. Among the many strengths of this program, the following are especially noteworthy:

1. Since Middle College is located on the community college campus, students are influenced by the "power of the site." The older college students who model appropriate and mature behavior do not go unnoticed by the high school students on the campus.

2. Since the faculty from the college and the high school are on the same campus, they are able to work together on curricular continuity. Many Middle College teachers are employed by the college as adjuncts to teach college classes to the regular college population, while college personnel frequently teach special college or high school classes for the Middle College students.

3. Middle College students who enroll in college classes receive the benefit of counseling, advisement, and tutoring from both the high school and the community college. For marginal students, this greatly enhances their chances for success.

4. Because the curriculum design of both Middle College and LaGuardia Community College features cooperative education programs with business and industry, there is the opportunity for Middle College students to earn college co-op credit while in high school, as well as credit for traditional college courses.

Limitations of Middle College. Although the Middle College and LaGuardia staffs have worked well together over the years, there are still significant differences between the institutions. Middle College staff are under contract with the New York City Board of Education, whereas LaGuardia staff are under contract with the City University of New York. Pay scales, school calendars, teaching loads, and other contractual areas differ. While most of the time these differences do not appear to get in the way, they do exist and must be dealt with sensitively by the administration of the two institutions.

A second limitation is the issue of credit transfer. As with all cases of collaboration between high schools and community colleges, the transferability of the college credits earned by the high school students depends on the articulation the community college has been able to arrange with four-year institutions.

Seattle University's Matteo Ricci College

Established in 1975, Matteo Ricci College (named after a 16th century Jesuit missionary to China) is a six-year program that begins with the freshman year in high school and concludes with a bachelor's degree awarded by Seattle University, a private, Catholic, Jesuit institution in Seattle, Washington. The program compresses the traditional eight-year sequence of high school and college into six years and addresses the problem of curriculum redundancy by offering as an alternative a well-articulated and integrated liberal arts education.

Although serving a much more select student body, this concurrent enrollment program bears some similarities to the Middle College High School in New York City.

Program Design. Matteo Ricci is divided into a lower division (Matteo Ricci I), conducted on the campus of Seattle Preparatory School, and an upper division (Matteo Ricci II), conducted on the campus of Seattle University. Each division takes three years to complete.

The curriculum in Matteo Ricci I features interdisciplinary courses in culture, literature, religion, and language skills development, artistic-aesthetic development, unified science, and psycho-physical study. The curriculum at Matteo Ricci II includes philosophy, language, art, a multidisciplinary approach to Western culture, social ecology, cultural interface, a three-quarter sequence in human inquiry, and a three-quarter sequence in the sixth year featuring interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary seminars. In addition, students may elect to take courses in traditional college majors and in such pre-professional areas as business, medicine, and engineering. Teachers for Matteo Ricci II are drawn from the faculty of Seattle University.

Faculty from Matteo Ricci I and II work closely in refining the nature and structure of years three and four, the "bridge years" when students make the transition between the two campuses. When students complete Matteo Ricci I, they are admitted to Matteo Ricci II. Or they may apply for admission to a traditional college or university through an early admissions program for high school students who have completed their junior year.

Student Population. Matteo Ricci I enrolls approximately 500 students, while Matteo Ricci II enrolls about half that number. The majority of the students are Catholic and live in the greater Seattle area. About a third of the students in the upper division live in dorms at Seattle University; the rest commute to school daily. Most students receive some form of financial aid and work either full- or part-time. According to Matteo Ricci administrators, most Matteo Ricci students score well above national norms on college aptitude tests such as the SAT and ACT.

Strengths of Matteo Ricci College. Because the upper and lower division faculty share a mission of providing a common student body with a strong liberal arts education, the curriculum is well-articulated with little redundancy. Students entering the program in the ninth grade may earn a baccalaureate degree in just six years, which represents considerable savings in tuition and room and board costs, especially since it is a private school. However, it is interesting to note that the program's administrators report that about one-half of the students at Matteo Ricci II elect to continue for at least one more year to complete a second bachelor's degree program in one of the traditional academic fields offered at Seattle University.

Limitations of Matteo Ricci College. Although Matteo Ricci officials report that students develop academically and socially as a result of their experiences in the program, many high school students do not have the maturity to handle an accelerated program that enables them to graduate from college at age 19 or 20. To its credit, Matteo Ricci is sensitive to this issue. Students are carefully evaluated before admission to the program and receive close supervision and support throughout the program and even thereafter. Also, students have the option of leaving the program and completing high school in the traditional Seattle Prep program.

In the event that students decide to leave the Matteo Ricci program and enroll in a more traditional high school or college, it may be difficult to evaluate their transfer credits because of the program's accelerated approach and unique curricular structure. This has been a concern of the Matteo Ricci administration, which has worked hard to articulate its program with other colleges and universities.

How to Start a Concurrent Enrollment Program

With the descriptions of concurrent enrollment programs presented in the previous chapter, it is clear that many different program models are possible; each has its strengths and limitations. But there are common elements that anyone considering establishing a concurrent enrollment program must consider. These are:

1. Identifying the students to be served,
2. Designing a program to serve these students,
3. Establishing relationships with local colleges and universities,
4. Determining a budget,
5. Developing community/student support, and
6. Evaluating the program.

Each of these elements will be discussed in this chapter along with suggestions for implementing a concurrent enrollment program.

Identifying the Students to be Served

The single most important decision in setting up a concurrent enrollment program is identifying the students to be served. Once this decision is made, all the other decisions will begin to fall into place.

At the outset, it must be noted that most school and college administrators tend to think of concurrent enrollment programs as primarily for high achieving students. But, as we have seen, many

kinds of students can be served if the program is properly designed. Also be aware that the kind of program established may depend on the level of community support demonstrated. Some school districts have resolved this dilemma by setting up several programs, each with its own target group of students.

Designing a Program to Serve These Students

If your goal is to eliminate curriculum redundancy, then you probably want a program that will be intellectually challenging to your high achievers and at the same time will give them a head start on their college careers. If your goal is to eliminate or reduce "senioritis," then you will want a program that offers highly motivating courses not currently available in your high school. If your goal is to motivate marginal students who have the academic potential to succeed in college, then you will want a program with a strong counseling component and perhaps some remedial courses. If your goal is to better prepare your vocational and technical students for careers in industry, then you might want to design a program in cooperation with your local community college.

In addition to serving particular groups of students, you may have other goals that the program can fulfill, such as your faculty's professional development. Some program designs require high levels of teacher involvement, even to the point of high school teachers becoming adjunct faculty at a college. If your goal is improving instructional practices, you might want to think about working with a school of education. Concurrent enrollment programs offer many options for improving the status and self-esteem of high school faculty.

Developing Relationships with Local Colleges and Universities

With the exception of the Advanced Placement Program, most concurrent enrollment programs are local or regional. It is easier to set

up a program locally because usually a liaison already exists between the high school counseling staff and the local college admissions personnel. This type of networking can be very helpful in setting up a new collaborative venture. And if there are several local colleges to work with, it may be possible to implement a variety of programs to serve different student populations. A good place to initiate dialogue about establishing a program is with college admissions personnel.

When approaching colleges and universities about participating in a concurrent enrollment program, keep in mind that they will have their own reasons for getting involved, not the least of which is student recruitment. Knowing this, you can negotiate better if you can offer a college the kind of students they are committed to serve. For example, a community college may prefer to work with average but motivated students rather than the top 10% of the senior class, who are likely to apply for admission at selective four-year institutions.

Also be aware when making a proposal that the decision-making process in colleges and universities is likely to be different from that of public school systems. In general, the decision-making process in higher education involves elaborate and lengthy deliberations by interdepartmental committees, various levels of administration, and may even involve the trustees of the institution. The lesson here is to be persistent but patient.

Determining a Budget

Launching any new program involves start-up costs as well as funds to maintain the program. There are no hard and fast rules as to which program model is the most cost efficient. Each has its special blend of costs and benefits. Keeping in mind that all may not be applicable to your situation, the following list covers items for which budgeting may be necessary:

- Program administration including travel
- Printing promotion/recruitment materials

- Student testing
- Counseling
- Application fees
- Transcript fees
- Student tuition
- Scholarships based on need/ability
- Staff development
- Curriculum development
- Instructional materials including textbooks
- Smaller than average class size
- Teacher stipends
- Program evaluation

In developing a budget that includes some or all of the above items, consideration also must be given to who pays for them. Among the parties that might contribute to the costs are the school district, students and their parents, the cooperating college, the state, foundations, or any combination of the above. In the final analysis, a variety of political, economic, and legal considerations will determine who can and will bear the costs.

For example, some states may not permit high school students to pay tuition for a college class taken as part of their regular instructional day. In other states, this same practice may be permissible so long as participation is voluntary. In still other localities, the practice may be acceptable so long as financial aid is available for students from low-income families. A few states solve the problem by paying the tuition for all students from state funds and channeling payments directly to students, or more likely, to cooperating colleges or local school districts. Of course, some colleges or universities may have tuition waiver or tuition reduction plans already in place for high school students, and your new program may be able to piggyback on such plans.

The message, then, is to explore all possible funding sources, keeping in mind the political, economic, and legal ramifications of your

program model. And do not overlook the prospects for funding sources outside your school district's regular tax levies.

Developing Community Support

Having decided on a program model to serve a target group of students and having secured funding for the program, the next challenge is "selling" your community on the merits of the program. If you know your community well, you probably designed a program that addresses the community's needs. In some communities issues of access and equity are paramount. In others, where a large percentage of high school graduates go on to college, the prospect of earning college credit in high school will be very appealing. Still another consideration is the relative wealth of the district, which may be a crucial factor in its willingness to allocate funds for a new program.

Existing programs in the district also may influence the support you receive. If your district already has the Advanced Placement Program (one in three high schools now offer AP), you may have to convince the community and the school board that it is time to broaden the base so more students can participate in a concurrent enrollment program. Of course, you have a stronger case if the program model you are proposing serves a different purpose than the AP program. It is also possible to introduce an element of competition by pointing out that a nearby school district offers a concurrent enrollment program and that your students are missing out on many benefits by not having such a program.

Another strategy is to work with a small but influential steering committee, or perhaps a subcommittee of your school board or the high school PTA. By convincing community leaders of the importance of the proposed program, they in turn will take the lead in persuading the community that this is something it should have. Conversely, ignoring these same leaders may doom your idea, no matter how strongly you believe in it.

Finally, you should consider the role your cooperating college may play in building support. In many communities with a local college, there are "town and gown" tensions, which the college administration would like to dispel. Again, knowing your own community's history and mores will guide you in approaching the college for support. If a good relationship already exists between the high school and college, by all means build on it. On the other hand, if a legacy of tension exists between the community and the college, then the college administration may view a concurrent enrollment program as one way of dissipating these tensions.

A second group to convince of the merits of a concurrent enrollment program are the students themselves. This is no easy task. By the time students are seniors, many of them feel they have earned the right to coast a bit. The prospect of a rigorous academic course with stiff exams and hours of homework a week may not be what they had in mind for their final year in high school. Simply telling them that it is "good" for them is not enough to persuade them to enroll. You are going to need help.

Begin by enlisting the help of the school staff. The principal, counselors who do college advising, homeroom teachers, subject teachers, and department heads all must be made aware of the purpose of the program, the benefits to be derived from it, and how it will work in practice. Usually one person in the counseling office should be designated as the prime source for information pertaining to the program. Students and their parents should be referred to this source.

Next, get the word about the program out to parents. Since they have a lot at stake, they can be a prime influence in persuading their children to participate in the program. An attractive brochure describing the program can be mailed by the high school or the cooperating college, or both. The PTA bulletin, "Career Days," and "College Fairs" are other means of spreading the word to parents. News releases to the local newspapers are another way to make the community aware of the program and its benefits.

All communications to parents should stress the program's positive features but at the same time should be honest concerning what involvement in the program means and does not mean. Be especially careful to give parents accurate information about any costs for which they will be responsible. Do not make claims that later you may not be able to support. For example, if you are not sure how credits earned through the program will transfer to other colleges, then make this clear. While generally a successful record of doing college-level work while in high school should help with admission to more selective colleges, make parents realize that you cannot guarantee it.

Once students and their parents have experienced a program that is carefully designed to meet the needs of the target population, is well administered and supervised, and delivers what it has promised at reasonable cost, then word of mouth will help to keep it going and growing.

Evaluating the Program

Often in the enthusiasm to start a new program, a critical element for its long-range success is overlooked — program evaluation. Actually, program evaluation ought to be considered when first developing the proposal for a concurrent enrollment program. Colleges and school districts will want to see evidence that their investment of resources is justified. And those responsible for directing the program will need data beyond their personal hunches in order to improve the program.

A systematic plan for collecting such data is the foundation of program evaluation. There are a variety of ways of collecting evaluation data. Some of the most common are: standardized testing, pre- and post-tests, surveys, attitude questionnaires, and interviews. Some of the kinds of data needed are:

- Academic achievement of participating students
- Student/teacher satisfaction with various aspects of the program

- Transferability of credit
- Attendance
- Costs
- Quality of instruction
- Number and demography of students participating
- Number of college credits registered for and earned through the program
- College application success of program participants
- Post-secondary performance of program participants

While data on student attitudes, behavior, and performance are essential for program evaluation, other constituencies are an important source of evaluative data. These include teachers and administrators from participating high schools and colleges, parents, school board members, college admissions officers, community opinion leaders — all of whom have information and insights to contribute.

Evaluation plans may be designed and conducted in-house or with help from outside consultants. The decision to use outside consultants may depend on the budget available, or the lack of district personnel with the time and/or skill to conduct the evaluation. Actually, there is merit in using an outside consultant to design the evaluation plan and then having local staff collect and analyze the data.

Joining forces with the cooperating college to conduct the evaluation also makes good sense. First, the college may have sophisticated evaluation resources that it is willing to share. Second, the college may have access to data not available to the school system. Third, in all likelihood the college will want to conduct its own internal program evaluation. Conducting a joint evaluation avoids unnecessary duplication of effort and provides savings in time and funds. And the results are usually more complete.

Appendix

Sources of Additional Information

If you are interested in learning more about concurrent enrollment programs, several organizations provide helpful information. Some of these are listed below with brief descriptions of their resources.

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

One of the major organizations in higher education, AAHE has taken a special interest in issues related to high school-college articulation. Two of its publications dealing with the topic are a monograph in its *Current Issues in Higher Education* series, titled *Academic Alliances: A New Approach to School/College Collaboration* (1985-86, No. 1), and *National Directory of School-College Partnerships: Current Models and Practices* (1987), by Wilbur, Lambert, and Young.

Center for High School-College Articulation
LaGuardia Community College
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City, NY 11101

The center publishes a newsletter highlighting recent developments in school-college partnerships, with a special focus on concurrent enrollment. The center also has published a *Yellow Pages* of school and college collaborative efforts. Its director, Janet Lieberman, is the origi-

nator of the Middle College concept and is a nationally recognized figure in this field.

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive
Reston, VA 20991

The professional organization of secondary school principals in the U.S., NASSP has published three works worthy of review: *College Courses in the High School* (1978), by Wilbur and Chapman; a special issue of its journal *NASSP Bulletin* (February 1983) on school-college communication; and *School-College Partnerships: A Look at the Major National Models* (1988), by Wilbur, Lambert, and Young.

Syracuse University Project Advance
111 Waverly Avenue, Suite 200
Syracuse, NY 13244

Project Advance is directed by Dr. Franklin P. Wilbur, nationally known for his work in the area of concurrent enrollment design and research. In addition to the Project Advance Program described in this fastback, the staff maintains one of the most comprehensive and up-to-date databases on school-college partnerships available. Project Advance conducts searches of its database for practitioners and researchers for a reasonable fee.

References

- Blanchard, B.E. *A National Survey of Curriculum Articulation Between the College of Liberal Arts and the Secondary School*. Chicago: DePaul University, 1971.
- Boyer, E.L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Boyer, E.L. *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.
- General Education in Schools and Colleges: A Committee Report*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Greenberg, A.R. "College Study in High School for Low and Moderate Achievers." Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1987.
- Hanson, H.P. "Twenty-Five Years of the Advanced Placement Program." *College Board Review* (Spring 1980).
- Kenniston, K. "What's Bugging the Students." *Educational Record* (Spring 1970).
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1983.
- Olson, L. "Network for Renewal: Goodlad Seeks Stronger School-University Alliances." *Education Week*, 18 March 1987.
- Osborn, J.W. *Overlapping and Omission in Our Course of Study*. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Company, 1928.

- Parnell, D. *The Neglected Majority*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, 1985.
- Ramist, L. "Predictive Validity of the ATP Tests." in *The College Board Technical Handbook for the Scholastic Aptitude Test and Achievement Tests*, edited by T.F. Donlon. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1984.
- Randall, R. "Options Are Changing the Face of Education in Minnesota." *The School Administrator* (May 1986).
- Regents of the University of the State of New York. *The Articulation of Secondary and Post-Secondary Education: A Statement of Policy and Proposed Action*. Albany, N.Y.: State Education Department, 1974.
- Rothman, R. "Enrollment Gains Linked to Marketing." *Education Week*, 15 October 1986.
- Sexton, P.C. *Education and Income*. New York: Viking, 1961.
- Tyler, J.; Gruber; and McMullen, B. *An Evaluation of the City University of New York/New York City Board of Education Collaborative Programs*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures, 1987.
- Wilbur, F.P. "School-College Partnerships: Building Effective Models for Collaboration." In *The School-College Connection: Relationships and Standards*. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1984.
- Wilbur, F.P., and LaFay, J.W. "The Transferability of College Credit Earned During High School: An Update." *College and University* 54, no. 1 (Fall 1978).

PKD Fastback Series Titles

105. The Good Mind
107. Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multi-Ethnic Education
108. Education and the Brain
111. Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision
114. Using Role Playing in the Classroom
115. Management by Objectives in the Schools
118. The Case for Competency-Based Education
119. Teaching the Gifted and Talented
120. Parents Have Rights, Too!
121. Student Discipline and the Law
123. Church-State Issues in Education
124. Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education
127. Writing Centers in the Elementary School
128. A Primer on Piaget
130. Dealing with Stress: A Challenge for Educators
131. Futuristics and Education
132. How Parent-Teacher Conferences Build Partnerships
133. Early Childhood Education: Foundations for Lifelong Learning
135. Performance Evaluation of Educational Personnel
137. Minimum Competency Testing
138. Legal Implications of Minimum Competency Testing
141. Magnet Schools: An Approach to Voluntary Desegregation
142. Intercultural Education
143. The Process of Grant Proposal Development
145. Migrant Education: Teaching the Wandering Ones
146. Controversial Issues in Our Schools
147. Nutrition and Learning
148. Education in the USSR
149. Teaching with Newspapers: The Living Curriculum
151. Bibliotherapy: The Right Book at the Right Time
153. Questions and Answers on Moral Education
154. Mastery Learning
155. The Third Wave and Education's Futures
156. Title IX: Implications for Education of Women
157. Elementary Mathematics: Priorities for the 1980s
159. Education for Cultural Pluralism: Global Roots Stem
160. Pluralism Gone Mad
161. Education Agenda for the 1980s
162. The Public Community College: The People's University
163. Technology in Education: Its Human Potential
164. Children's Books: A Legacy for the Young
165. Teacher Unions and the Power Structure
166. Progressive Education: Lessons from Three Schools
167. Basic Education: A Historical Perspective
168. Aesthetic Education and the Quality of Life
169. Teaching the Learning Disabled
170. Safety Education in the Elementary School
171. Education in Contemporary Japan
172. The School's Role in the Prevention of Child Abuse
174. Youth Participation for Early Adolescents: Learning and Serving in the Community
175. Time Management for Educators
176. Educating Verbally Gifted Youth
179. Microcomputers in the Classroom
180. Supervision Made Simple
181. Educating Older People: Another View of Mainstreaming
182. School Public Relations: Communicating to the Community
183. Economic Education Across the Curriculum
184. Using the Census as a Creative Teaching Resource
185. Collective Bargaining: An Alternative to Conventional Bargaining
186. Legal Issues in Education of the Handicapped
187. Mainstreaming in the Secondary School: The Role of the Regular Teacher
188. Tuition Tax Credits: Fact and Fiction
189. Challenging the Gifted and Talented Through Mentor-Assisted Enrichment Projects
190. The Case for the Smaller School
191. What You Should Know About Teaching and Learning Styles
192. Library Research Strategies for Educators
193. The Teaching of Writing in Our Schools
194. Teaching and the Art of Questioning
195. Understanding the New Right and Its Impact on Education
196. The Academic Achievement of Young Americans
197. Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student
198. Management Training for School Leaders: The Academy Concept
199. What Should We Be Teaching in the Social Studies?
200. Mini-Grants for Classroom Teachers
201. Master Teachers
202. Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform
203. Pros and Cons of Merit Pay
205. The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten
206. Philosophy for Children: An Approach to Critical Thinking
207. Television and Children
208. Using Television in the Curriculum
209. Writing to Learn Across the Curriculum
210. Education Vouchers
211. Decision Making in Educational Settings
213. The School's Role in Educating Severely Handicapped Students
214. Teacher Career Stages: Implications for Staff Development
215. Selling School Budgets in Hard Times
216. Education in Healthy Lifestyles: Curriculum Implications
217. Adolescent Alcohol Abuse
218. Homework—And Why

(Continued on inside back cover)

Fastback Titles *(continued from back cover)*

219. **America's Changing Families: A Guide for Educators**
220. **Teaching Wildly Retarded Children in the Regular Classroom**
221. **Changing Behavior: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Parents**
222. **Issues and Innovations in Foreign Language Education**
223. **Grievance Arbitration in Education**
224. **Teaching About Religion in the Public Schools**
225. **Promoting Voluntary Reading in School and Home**
226. **How to Start a School/Business Partnership**
227. **Bilingual Education Policy: An International Perspective**
228. **Planning for Study Abroad**
229. **Teaching About Nuclear Disarmament**
230. **Improving Home-School Communications**
231. **Community Service Projects: Citizenship in Action**
232. **Outdoor Education: Beyond the Classroom Walls**
233. **What Educators Should Know About Copyright**
234. **Teenage Suicide: What Can the Schools Do?**
235. **Legal Basics for Teachers**
236. **A Model for Teaching Thinking Skills: The Inclusion Process**
237. **The Induction of New Teachers**
238. **The Case for Basic Skills Programs in Higher Education**
239. **Recruiting Superior Teachers: The Interview Process**
240. **Teaching and Teacher Education: Implementing Reform**
241. **Learning Through Laughter: Humor in the Classroom**
242. **High School Dropouts: Causes, Consequences, and Cure**
243. **Community Education: Processes and Programs**
244. **Teaching the Process of Thinking, K-12**
245. **Dealing with Abnormal Behavior in the Classroom**
246. **Teaching Science as Inquiry**
247. **Mentor Teachers: The California Model**
248. **Using Microcomputers in School Administration**
249. **Missing and Abducted Children: The School's Role in Prevention**
250. **A Model for Effective School Discipline**
251. **Teaching Reading in the Secondary School**
252. **Educational Reform: The Forgotten Half**
253. **Voluntary Religious Activities in Public Schools: Policy Guidelines**
254. **Teaching Writing with the Microcomputer**
255. **How Should Teachers Be Educated? An Assessment of Three Reform Reports**
256. **A Model for Teaching Writing: Process and Product**
257. **Preschool Programs for Handicapped Children**
258. **Serving Adolescents' Reading Interests Through Young Adult Literature**
259. **The Year-Round School: Where Learning Never Stops**
260. **Using Educational Research in the Classroom**
261. **Microcomputers and the Classroom Teacher**
262. **Writing for Professional Publication**
263. **Adopt a School—Adopt a Business**
264. **Teenage Parenthood: The School's Response**
265. **AIDS Education: Curriculum and Health Policy**
266. **Dialogue Journals: Writing as Conversation**
267. **Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools**
268. **Education: By Invitation Only**
269. **Mission Possible: Innovations in the Bronx Schools**
270. **A Primer on Music for Non-Musician Educators**
271. **Extraordinary Educators: Lessons in Leadership**
272. **Religion and the Schools: Significant Court Decisions in the 1980s**
273. **The High-Performing Educational Manager**
274. **Student Press and the Hazelwood Decision**
275. **Improving the Textbook Selection Process**
276. **Effective Schools Research: Practice and Promise**
277. **Improving Teaching Through Coaching**
278. **How Children Learn a Second Language**
279. **Eliminating Procrastination Without Putting It Off**
280. **Early Childhood Education: What Research Tells Us**
281. **Personalizing Staff Development: The Career Lattice Model**
282. **The Elementary School Publishing Center**
283. **The Case for Public Schools of Choice**
284. **Concurrent Enrollment Programs: College Credit for High School Students**
285. **Educators' Consumer Guide to Private Tutoring Services**
286. **Peer Supervision: A Way of Professionalizing Teaching**
287. **Differentiated Career Opportunities for Teachers**
288. **Controversial Issues in Schools: Dealing with the Inevitable**
289. **Interactive Television: Progress and Potential**

This fastback and others in the series are made available at low cost through the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, established in 1966 with a bequest from George H. Reavis, an Ohio educator. The foundation exists to promote better understanding of the nature of the educative process and the relation of education to human welfare.

Write to Phi Delta Kappa, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789, or call (812) 339-1156, for quantity discounts for any title or combination of titles.